1:Spier E-5 (1918) 1928
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

595 informant stated that the wives might either be sisters or unrelated: one arrangement was as harmonious as another. But another informant denied that sisters could be plural wives. Seven households in which there were two wives were remembered, four of them belonging to men now living, and I surmise that this approaches the number existing during any one man's lifetime. These informants had heard of three wives, but had never seen such a family.

A man who wants to take a second wife consults his first wife and may abide by her decision. Of course, he does not go to live with the second wife's family, but takes her directly to his establishment. The presents given in this case would amount to about the same value as those given his first wife's parents. Both wives or all three live in a single house with their husband, even when they have large families. They might, however, have separate houses in one camp. There seems to be no difference in the treatment of the two wives. When their husband dies [768] they separate, returning to their relatives with their children. Co-wives 428 probably share equally in the inheritance, for the disposition of property seems to be influenced chiefly by the number of their children. The impression is that the heritage is really that of the children. This is confirmed by the general practice, for if a widow re-marries soon, the [587] inheritance reverts to her children; it does in any event when they are old enough to enjoy it.

In one plural marriage for which there is definite information 595 Manakadja had already married Gwegweθgwaia at the time the Paiute took up residence in the Walapai country. He sent her away and took a Paiute wife at Pine Spring. Later he brought his bride to the canyon and took Gwegweθgwaia back, living with both of them until the Paiute woman died.

There is said to be no divorce, but I recorded other instances of 586 arbitrary separation. Wa°kwanima sent his first wife away, after she had borne a son, Tcikapaniga, because she was "no good." He then took two wives by whom he had a number of children, Pete, Mark, etc. (see the genealogy, p. 392.) When he died the widows returned to their relatives with their little children. These children regard each other alike as siblings, the divorce of Tcikapaniga's mother makes no difference to them. In fact, Pete lived with his eldest brother before he was married. Other cases are Pagadjahuda and Supai Jack's father who separated because they were angry, and Crook's Yavapai and Roger's Walapai wives who ran off home.

586 One informant stated that a wife was not divorced even in case of 684 adultery; the husband would thrash her partner in shame with his fists,

1: Spier E-5 (1918) 1928
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

ing additional fields. Proprietary rights in land depend most emphatically on use, for unless it is generally understood that a patch has not been finally abandoned, someone does not fail to occupy it if it is at all cultivable. 311 423

The cultivated land forms a continuous strip through the canyon of corn and alfalfa fields, pastures, orchards, and groves. Boundaries are definite and marked by fences, lines of trees, or ditches. Fencing may be an old custom as Cushing saw wooden fences in use in 1881.[1]

Title to land is in the hands of the men, although because of its utilization title might better be characterized as joint ownership by the family, the economic unit that works it. Women rarely have independent control of land; those who have are invariably widows without other means of support. For instance, a Walapai widow who lives with her Havasupai stepdaughter has taken an unattractive patch for her own. When a woman marries she transfers her planting activities from her own family fields to those of her husband. Children are never land owners, although they may help their elders to plant. There is not even nominal ownership in order to distribute the hazard of bad luck such as occurs among the White Mountain Apache. If parents have sufficient land, they allow their adult children to plant in the surplus. Thus, Teikapaniga and his wife let their children, Jess (and his wife) and Helen, use half their land. Since Helen married she assists her husband in planting his fields. 423 [592] [589]

Land is inherited in the male line. All the sons share in the joint heritage, which may remain undivided for years until they have established families whose diverse interests make parceling desirable. The widow and unmarried daughters share at least in the use of the land, but they cannot be said to have title to it, since the widow's relatives and the daughter's children never inherit it from them. If the widow re-marries too soon, her interest is lost, reverting to the other heirs. In the absence of direct heirs, i.e., sons or their male descendants, unmarried daughters, or widow, the property goes to the dead man's brothers or their male heirs. Evidently daughters retain some right to share the use of their parents' land even after they marry, since a portion is often set aside for them to plant for the support of their children. Such land normally reverts to their fathers' families. Divorced and widowed women have at all times the privilege of falling back on the parental lands for support. 428 [562] [589] [736]

[1] Cushing, (a), 374; compare Zuñi sand-mound boundaries [Cushing, (d), 152] and Navaho fences of brush [Stephen, (b), 354].

1:Spier E-5 (1918) 1928
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

428 A typical instance of male succession is that of Kaδada and his three nephews. Apart from other holdings Kaδada's father owned a large tract (from Camps 55 to 57 and beyond, see map, Fig. 50) which Kaδada and his elder brother inherited. The three sons of the latter fell heir to his share. In the flood of 1911 the creek assumed a new course, dividing this tract neatly in two; whereupon Kaδada took the section [133] west of the creek for his own and gave up using any part of the eastern portion. His nephews kept the eastern tract undivided, even after the death of the middle member of the trio. All three lived together on this tract (Camp 57) until the youngest, Tobey, established his home on land inherited from his maternal grandmother's brother (Camp 55). A small part of the tract south of Camp 55 lay abandoned for years. Kaδada's intention of reclaiming it was well known at the time of my first visit, but considered vague; in 1919, he cleared it.

Bob's land was inherited by his widow and her adult son by a former husband. Bob had no male relatives; his older sister, who is well provided for, and another sister's grandson, who often lived with him, received nothing. The heirs have not divided the land.

Nina planted a cornfield independent of her husband. The field belonged to her father's younger brother, Panamida, who let her use it for the support of her two small 423 sons. After her death, Panamida took it back, planting there the next season contrary to custom, but with the approval of the community. Panamida gives some of the corn to Nina's sons.

An uncultivated field, now used only as the dance ground, is claimed by Smiley and Panamida. Smiley, who owned the land, gave it to his daughter for the use of her children; she having married Panamida. She and all her children, save one, are now dead. Panamida claims the field as his, but Smiley says that now the children are dead the field is his again.

425 Land is also exchanged and sold. Sinyella exchanged a strip of corn land near Rock Jones's house with the latter for a piece below Navaho Falls on which he then planted fig trees. When Jess married he bought a piece of uncleared land for a house site and pasture from Manakadja (an acre and a half for thirty-five dollars). In a measure, this is land given for support of a woman relative—although the price is fair enough —since Jess's wife formerly lived with Manakadja, her mother's father and her nearest male relative save one.

The products of the land belong to those who own it. Others who 423 assist in caring for the harvest, etc., have no proprietary rights although 465 they are commonly paid in kind. This is distinctly compensation. For instance, on one occasion Sinyella had eight women assisting him in curing the fruit of the many peach trees he owns. Two were members of his family group; the others were not closely related. Each one received part of the crop in payment.

Natural products also belong to the land-owner. Trees and brush 423 may not be cut without his consent. Austin owns a cornfield, inherited from his paternal grandfather, west of the old creek bed. In the flood of

1:Spier E-5 (1918) 1928
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

422 Other property consists of houses, horses, dress, weapons and tools, and the immaterial possessions, shamanistic materials and chieftainship. 423 342 So far as houses may be conceived as individually owned, they belong to the male head, since he can send his wife (and children?) away. But nothing else is possible, since the field in which it stands belongs to him. [462] [768] At least all the heavier work of house building is done by the men. The house is burned after the death of an inmate.

Horses and cattle are owned and herded by men alone. They have 422 had a fair number of these ever since Spanish days: Garcés found them [462] plentifully supplied with live stock in 1776.[1] Two or three good riding [175] horses are killed on their owner's death; others are given away. Saddles [768] are often burned or destroyed, sometimes being left on the horse when it is killed.

Personal possessions are not numerous. Men and women own their blankets and clothing, with perhaps a gala dress apiece. A man owns his weapons, tools, some buckskins, and perhaps a mask and charm or two; a woman her household utensils, pots, baskets, and field tools. In other words, each owns the articles peculiar to his sex. Husband and wife own and dispose of their possessions independently. I have never seen either [593] interfere with the other's transaction when selling specimens to me: 422 advice was, however, sometimes asked and acted on. Children own little 432 or no property, a condition which struck both Cushing[2] and myself as 858 being sharply in contrast with that at Zuñi. For instance, when buying a small burden basket used solely by a little girl, her mother set the price. Laying this simply to the girl's bashfulness, I offered the coin to her Zuñi-fashion, but her mother objected, claiming it as hers. To test this, I attempted to buy a similar basket from Jess's little daughter. This had been made and presented to her by her paternal grandmother. But the bargain was struck by her parents, although they turned the purchase money over to her. Perhaps boys are somewhat more favorably situated, since they freely sold their bows and arrows when I met them hunting in sport. These weapons were all products of their elders.

A dying man states his wishes respecting the disposal of his posses- 428 sions. This includes land, although the succession to this is rather predetermined. To be sure, most of his choicest belongings, clothing, weap- [768] ons, horse, etc., are burned or buried with him. Such articles as are permitted to remain are inherited by his children or by members of his family. A woman's possessions go to her children or to her own family.

[1] Coues, 337 et seq.
[2] Cushing, (a), 851.

1: Spier E-5 (1918) 1928
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

Since the little that is transmitted is acquired by the sex to which it is pertinent, there is little inheritance of a husband's or wife's goods by the survivor. 428

A dying shaman might choose a successor to whom he transmits his spirit and paraphernalia. Bob told people that when his grandfather was about to die, the latter instructed him and gave him his spirit. Bob died at odds with life; he wanted his spirit to leave him and he gave instructions that his rattles and medicines (?) be broken and buried with him rather than give them to his relatives. Chief's status is inherited, normally in the male line. There are some indications, as given in the next section, that chieftainship is not an office to be filled by a single incumbent, but transmissible and divisible property. 756 424 428 622 424 428

CHIEFTAINSHIP

There are six chiefs today, one of whom occupies a superior status and is recognized by the agent as the head chief; the others are equally leaders. These men have become chiefs through inheritance, through prestige and renown, or both. Women are never chiefs. Chieftainship is emphatically not a position; it is the embodiment of certain somewhat vague functions. [624 [648]

The Havasupai are accustomed to speak of "big chiefs" and "little chiefs," but I cannot find that there are different words in their language expressing these ideas, or that there is any difference in function. Manakadja, who succeeded his uncle Captain Navajo to the head chieftainship established since reservation days, is called "big chief." But it is clear from the accounts that follow that all that is meant is an especially important chief, the most prominent individual in the tribe. Like the little chiefs, Manakadja is called *gámúlva* or *kahá'l*,[1] but he is also known as *handtáva*, superlatively good.[2] Little chiefs are also (collectively?) called *múlovagldjlgálà*. Jess differentiated between them by *múlvik'ádja* and *pagamúlvákavátčka*, literally, little chief and big-chief-man.

Chieftainship is defined only by its functions, which consist largely of giving advice and admonitions. This is so largely true that it might be said not that a chief is one who talks, but that one who talks is a chief. Chiefs tell their people how to act, especially the young men and women. The former are admonished to work, farm, hunt, and make clothing and moccasins; the latter to gather seeds, cook, plant, and make baskets. 183 624

[1] Compare the Mohave *kokots* for the dance leader. The Havasupai are not familiar with the word and were inclined to believe that it was a Hopi word for chief, *kwahóh*. [171]

[2] The Cocopa headman is also called good-man (information from R. H. Lowie). The Yuma head chief is *hom-ak-thal* (Trippel, 308).

1:Spier E-5 (1918) 1928
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

624 They are told not to be lazy, to care properly for themselves and their
[183] families, their farms, and their property.

If a man refused to obey their advice, refusing to work, they would
624 repeat their admonitions: "Do not be lazy, do not cause trouble. If
626 you do not work or help others, you may get into trouble or you may starve and nobody will help you then. Somebody might even kill or whip you [which is purely a threat]. If you work and raise plenty to eat, people will come to eat with you, so you and they will have a good time; but if you are lazy, everybody will treat you accordingly. When you marry your wife and children may starve to death. Do not be lazy!" In an obstinate case, they paid no more attention to the delinquent, but let him go his way. He would go about from camp to camp, receiving a little food in return for such small services as collecting wood.

Chiefs address their remarks to the assemblages on appropriate
624 occasions (*skwigwaulg*, to stand up to talk), such as dances, formal gatherings for the discussion of important topics, invitations, etc., during battle, at death ceremonies, or informally at the sweatlodges. The
[156] advice of the big chiefs carries more weight than that of the others
[554] partly by reason of their position, but largely because they were stronger characters. No one chief was either war or dance leader. In battle any
[701] chief temporarily assumed a directive capacity; the warriors would give more attention to a big chief.

It is not clear that there is any other function beside giving advice. After the flood in 1918 washed the lower irrigating system completely away, Manakadja went about setting stakes to re-locate the ditch. Possibly this is his function, but this ditch supplied his fields as well as those of his neighbors. During the dances all of the chiefs took some leading part in the feasting, racing, etc., but it did not appear they had any peculiar functions. It is quite clear that chiefs have neither power nor prerogatives; they are simply leaders.

Men become chiefs by prestige and renown based on their prowess
624 in war, their prominence in intertribal relations, and their wisdom dis-
554 played in council, or by reason of inheritance. Personal qualifications
428 are an important factor in the latter case too. A chief must be dignified, industrious, and even tempered; a son who does not display these qualities will have little chance of ever being called chief. Sinyella's father failed to inherit his father's status as big chief, partly because he was such a man and partly because he was completely eclipsed by a rival big chief, Wasákwívámă. Captain Navajo instructed Manakadja and Captain Jim, his older brother's sons, in the ways of a chief; Manakadja in turn is instructing his own sons in the same informal way.

1: Spier E-5 (1918) 1928
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

It is not quite clear what is inherited; on the whole it seems to be the right to be styled chief, provided one shows signs of leadership. Yet Manakadja said that when Captain Navajo died his property was divided between himself, Captain Jim, and their half-brothers; at the same time he became the head chief and Captain Jim became a little chief. He spoke of the chieftainship as if it were property. It is significant that none of the three half-brothers (sons of the same father) are chiefs; at the same time it is recognized that all three are mentally subnormal. Sinyella's account of this situation, given below, is somewhat different. Chieftainship is usually inherited in the male line, but there is more than one instance where the connecting relative was a woman. 624 554 428

Men do not suddenly become chiefs, Manakadja being an exception, but people gradually come to call them so, as they develop prominence. They emphatically do not acquire official positions. 554 624

In speculative works on the development of government so much is made of the dominating character and prowess of chiefs that a few words defining that of the six Havasupai chiefs may not be amiss. Manakadja, the head chief, is a man of seventy, dignified, reserved, somewhat simple, and with a quiet humor; a man who spends much time in a sedentary way at home, is usually "on show," but far from pompous. He is an indifferent talker. His brother Captain Jim, slightly younger, is energetic, active as an organizer of the younger men, particularly in relations with the Walapai and Navaho, who usually send dance invitations, etc., intended for the tribe to him.. He is not a fluent talker but commands respect. Watahomidja, a man of about the same age, is quiet, reserved, not especially dignified, and is the center of the conservative element. He is a fluent talker, but not emphatic, and, I suspect, somewhat cynical. Panamida is a little younger; he is phlegmatic, not especially dignified, fond of horse-racing and encourages the boys in that sport. Big Jim, fifty-nine, is energetic, aggressive, busy, a fluent and effective speech-maker, making free use of rapid and graphic gestures, and a potent influence in council. Sinyella, aged seventy-one, is quiet, kindly, far more industrious than the average, shrewd, observant, and active in directing the dances. Like Manakadja he is a poor talker. Jess gave the consensus of opinion on the order of the best speechmakers as Big Jim, Watahomidja, and Captain Jim, which agrees with my own observations. I cannot believe that these men are the most powerful personalities, as theory would have it, for there are others of the same age and character who have not the good fortune to be called chiefs. Furthermore, there is another outlet for the exceptional individual, namely, shamanism. In fact, I [648] [537] 554 756

1: Spier E-5 (1918) 1928
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

The Walapai knew Captain Navajo as chief very well. After his death, the Walapai big chief thought who would be big chief here: "I think that old man Captain Cave would be pretty good, but he is a very old man and could not be chief long." Next he thought of me [Sinyella] and of Supai Charley [Wasákwivámă's oldest living son], but he thought Manakadja, who is related to Nava'o, would be better. "He is not old; I think he would be pretty good; I think he can take Navajo's place." We had no chief, so we took Manakadja in his place at once. Manakadja had never done anything notable but we accepted him. They called him just a little chief [?—I think he means that Manakadja would only be a little chief if the agent did not recognize him as head chief]. The Walapai big chief and Captain Navajo were fast friends; that is why he interfered. The Havasupai owed no allegiance to him. 624 648 159

Captain Jim was [probably] not a chief before Navajo's death. He always went to the Walapai death ceremonies, where he would make speeches after the Walapai chief. So the Walapai call him a little chief. Our people do not call him chief. [This is not true.] Perhaps if Manakadja or Captain Jim died, one of their half-brothers would take his place.

My father's paternal grandfather was a big chief, a very big chief. He had two wives, each bore him two boys. The oldest brother was told, when he was a young man, that he would have his father's place. He was big chief a short time when the enemy killed him. The oldest boy by the other wife was told to be big chief; after a very short time the Yavapai killed him too. This man's younger brother was made big chief; he was killed by the Paiute after a short time. The last one was made big chief when he had grown to manhood. They said, "We want you to take your brothers' place and be big chief." This one was my paternal grandfather. He had two sons; the younger died. The older was my father. When my grandfather was killed, people said that his big chieftainship was gone. So they did not call my father chief. After my father died, I traveled everywhere so that the Walapai, Oraibi Hopi, and the Navaho came to know me well and they called me little chief. I did not want to be big chief.

Dean [Sinyella's second son] said to me, "You are descended from the big chief, but you are not big chief. Pretty soon you will die; then I will be big chief." Lenoman [the eldest son] will be little chief in my place, but Dean wants to be big chief. He said, "That big chief down there [Manakadja] don't go about. When I am big chief, I will ride around all the time and talk, talk, talk." I said to Dean, "I will die soon and then you will be big chief." Watahomidja will be a big chief too some time. 624 159

Watahomidja is a little chief; his father was not. But he inherits the chieftainship from his maternal grandfather who was also little chief by inheritance from Pa'hlégа'mf'I. Watahomidja is a good man, and old enough. He tells the people what to do, and they do it, for his advice is good. Soon they will call him big chief, because he is related to Pa'hlégа'mf'I. I hear him; he talks well.

Big Jim's father was not a chief, but his older brother was a little chief. Big Jim took his place when he died. The Walapai, Hopi, Navaho, and Yavapai all know him: he is a good friend of theirs, so they call him little chief. [Jess added that if Big Jim died they might call Little Jim, his half-brother by the same father, chief in his place.]

The principle involved in these cases is clearly that a man is recognized as a leader because of a combination of distinguishing characteristics, bravery, enterprise, and shrewdness. There is a tendency to transmit 428 624 554

[Text continues on p. 243]

1: Spier E-5 (1918) 1928
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

the social position he makes for himself by inheritance, but the heir must have demonstrated his own ability before others will recognize that he has inherited the status.

There are no formal councils: most matters of importance are discussed by the groups lying about the sweatlodges waiting an opportunity to enter. Occasionally, somewhat more formal meetings are held. On August 11, 1918 two Walapai, Doctor Tommy, a shaman, and Waglaga, both elderly men, arrived. The following morning word was circulated that there would be a meeting at Captain Jim's camp. About forty adult men seated themselves in a rough semicircle, partly along a convenient bank, with the two Walapai at one end. Manakadja sat opposite the group at the center of the arc. Waglaga spoke first, then Bob, a Havasupai shaman, Doctor Tommy, Big Jim, Captain Jim, Watahomidja, and Manakadja. Neither Sinyella nor Panamida, the other two chiefs, were present. The Walapai brought an invitation to attend a mourning ceremony to be given in memory of a Walapai chief, who before he died the year previous had asked that his friends, the Havasupai, be invited. They asked who was going to the meeting. Bob replied for himself that he had just recovered from illness and was too weak to go. Big Jim, Captain Jim, and Watahomidja repeated the Walapai message and asked who was going. Manakadja also repeated it and announced that he did not intend to go. The delivery of the Walapai was almost a chant, continued as long as the breath held out. Roger, a young man, hard of hearing, seated before them, repeated their concluding words, until the speaker, taking another breath, proceeded, first repeating his own last words. Thus, Waglaga, "Something is not good"; Roger, "Not good"; Waglaga, beginning again, "Not good, but so and so . . . " Sometimes Roger would add a phrase to carry the sense forward, as "Someone is not willing"; Roger, "Not willing, but so and so is . . . "; Waglaga, "Not willing, but so and so is, and therefore . . . ". Some of Roger's additions were evidently semi-humorous as they provoked laughter. The speeches of the Havasupai were more declamatory: they had no such aids.[1] At the end of every man's speech there was a chorus of approval; *hdnlgd*, good. The Walapai brought and passed about a quipu, a woolen cord six inches long, with seven knots representing the seven days until the ceremony, viz., they would start in three days, take two days on the trip, and the next day (August 18) the meeting would begin. The knotted cord was handed about and explained privately at the end of the speech making

[1] These speeches were not recorded.

1:Spier E-5 (1918) 1928
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

cured, and Rock Jones, a weather shaman. Bob had his spirit from his maternal grandfather, he is reported as having said. When he was about to die he instructed Bob and presented his spirit to him. In late years Bob suffered severely from tuberculosis, coughing up blood, and with it lost his spirit—and his influence. Manakadja, the head chief, called in a Yavapai shaman for his daughter, which angered hot-tempered Bob to the extent that he refused to leave his spirit to a relative. Usually when a shaman is sick his spirit stays with him and cures him, but Bob's spirit left him, because he willed it, and so he died. His rattles and medicines (?) were broken and buried with him. Rock Jones inherited his powers from his maternal uncle, whose specialty was also rain making. Sinyella's maternal grandfather was a shaman, but no one inherited his power. Perhaps there is only a tendency toward inheritance;[1] so far as it goes the attitude is that toward personal property.

In the final analysis, power comes through dreams: all three types of shaman dream, and it is also probably necessary for those who inherit spirits to dream. Rock Jones, for instance, dreamed of lightning and thunder, saw the pouring rain and hail, and dreamed that he sang to make it rain. Now he uses that song.

Only the curing shamans (*gl0ijv'*) have spirits; in one instance it was stated that a shaman temporarily had more than one. Sinyella said that his maternal grandfather frequently dreamed of the wolf. When he sang for the sick the wolf spirit (*hatägwi'ladmdg*) could be heard out in the darkness. Then his own familiar spirit went outside, whereupon the wolf spirit entered his body and performed the cure for him. When the cure was completed this wolf spirit left him again. This man was also a weather shaman.

The important shaman is the one who cures. Dreaming comes before practice. Mark is said to be trying to become one, but is not proficient yet. His gourd rattle is placed at the head of his bed: when he wakes he seizes it and tries the song he has dreamed. During the half-year since this practice began he has sung over his sick nephew, Jess, many times, but he has not attempted sucking out the disease. In 1919 I was told that Little Jim was becoming a shaman. He had seen a spirit in his dreams but it was afraid as yet to enter his body. My informant stated that it was too early to know whether Jim would be a success. In 1921 he was a full-fledged shaman, though not prominent. His first patient was Melvin in October, 1920 (p. 279).

[1] It is doubtful that there is any significance in these instances in the inheritance from a maternal relative.

1: Spier E-5 (1918) 1928
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

parents have eaten portions of deer carcasses killed and partly devoured by wolves or mountain lions, or of rabbits abandoned by eagles. The baby is sung over by the doctor who knows the songs about these animals or the eagle[1] as the case may be. Potions are not administered by the doctor nor by any other. The eagle song is as follows, the last line being repeated three times:—

sakàhûtaŋa àsá
eagle eagle
ĭnyàhátẽŋe ĭnyanyàhátá
my domestic animal my dog
ĭyàwaiẽŋe yuwaĭà
you concern my heart my heart
huyuwĭ'nõŋa hu
head head

Descumalaua's father was a snake doctor. A man who had been struck in the calf by a rattler came to his house. He immediately made short incisions all about the puncture, tied a ligature about it, and sucked out the blood. At night he sang just as a shaman does, waving a feather (the longest from the eagle's wing, covered with white gypsum) over the wound.[2] A ring of sagebrush (*Artemisia ludoviciana*) is put around the limb to draw out the poison, not the blood, on the ground that the snake may know and use this plant. The snake doctor can cure the bites of the three snakes recognized as poisonous, viz., àluwi'tavà, the prairie rattlesnake (*Crotalus confluentus* Say), haiwi'tà, the Pacific rattlesnake (*C. oreganus* Holbrook), àluwĭhalàl'dàl'dà, the western striped racer. (However the last, a fierce fighter, is not a venomous snake).[3]

One who was struck by a snake would catch it and, grasping each jaw, attempt to split it in two. If the snake split quite to the tail, he would recover, otherwise he would die.

The shaman's rattle is a gourd, obtained from the Hopi. Each shaman presumably has his own, but one that belongs to a layman may be borrowed by those who want to cure. (One such rattle was also borrowed for the Mohave dance). They may also be inherited as part of the shamanistic properties.

[1] The Maricopa have eagle doctors "because they are afraid of eagles" (Mohave information, Bourke (a), 172).

[2] Another time the informant said that this was a Walapai practice only.

[3] These are probable identifications made by Miss Edna M. Fisher from native sketches and descriptions. In addition my informant recognized three non-poisonous snakes: *alyaĭlta*, the Arizona gopher snake (*Pituophis catenifer ruthus* van Denburgh), *hanpaipita*, the Arizona king snake (*Lampropeltis pyromelana* Cope), and *hatàmtà*, possibly the spotted night snake (*Hypsiglena ochrorhyncha ochrorhyncha*).

DEATH CUSTOMS

763 [171] Relatives gather before the death and begin to cry: this however does not seem so stereotyped a procedure as that of the Mohave[1] and Walapai. The corpse is laid with his head to the northwest, his hair is 764 washed, face painted, and he is dressed in good clothes contributed by relatives and friends. Sometimes the face is covered. The following day everyone gathers to wail for several hours or perhaps the whole day. [624] The chiefs talk, particularly to the relatives, admonishing them to care for the property of the deceased and not to commit suicide. The mourners [171] do not sing or dance as they know the Mohave and Walapai do.

Formerly, the body was placed on a pyre at some distance from the [178] camp, together with the choicest possessions of the deceased. Nowadays it is buried with these objects among the rocks of the lower canyon level somewhere near the falls below the village. After a few days such 768 of the dead man's belongings as were in the camps on the plateau are brought down and burned on the grave. Two or three good horses are killed at the grave (their bodies are probably not burned) or they are pushed over the cliff. Saddles are often burned or destroyed; sometimes they are left on the horses. On the return of the funeral party a corpse [783] bearer might wash his hands, or bathe, and possibly wash his clothes. There is no formal purification, nor are those who come in contact with the corpse shunned.

764 178 Cremation began to go out of use sixty years ago, the last body being burned twenty-five years back. The change was not suggested nor enforced by the whites. "We wanted to change: we thought burning was not a good way." I am not certain that the change coincided with the introduction of the Ghost dance influences in 1870.

768 178 Formerly the house of the deceased was burned. Now, as a rule, the brush covering alone is burned, the timbers being saved to re-build elsewhere, though there is no great change in location. The modern frame house is abandoned for some time. Thus, when their boy died in 1918, Prince and his family went to live with his wife's father. In 1920 he built another house across the creek from the old one, and in 1921 he was living part of the time in both structures.

768 [183] [428] Farm land which belonged to the dead is allowed to lie idle for a year or two. This is not always the case, for Panamida planted in Nina's fields (his older brother's daughter) the year following her death; though, to be sure, the field really belonged to him. Should there be dependants,

[1]Kroeber, (a), 281.

1: Spier E-5 (1918) 1928
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

however, half the crop only is cut down and burned; the remainder goes to the survivors. Fruit trees may be owned independently of the land on which they stand. The owner may make a dying wish that they be cut down and burned.

Mourning may be continued by a widow for a half year or longer before she re-marries, though some marry within a few months. During this period she takes no particular interest in her appearance.

There are no mourning ceremonies (cf. the Walapai mourning, p. 267). In the case of Fred's death in 1919, however, most of the tribesmen met to wail for an hour or so a week after he was buried. This is said to be the first time that there has been a mourning ceremony "like the Walapai", but there was no dancing, etc. The so-called Mohave dance (p. 267) has been taken over from the Walapai mourning ceremony, but it is not used in mourning.

No offerings are made to the dead. There is no great repugnance to talking about them, but they do not like to do so freely. They never go near the burial ground, never acceded to my request to visit it, and always took my hints at searching for myself somewhat amiss. Mr. Gensler, the former agent, has noted that they are quite suspicious of the circumstances of death occurring away from the house.

Comparative Notes

Two methods of disposing of the dead are in vogue in this general area, cremation and burial. These have well-defined areas of distribution. The first area of cremation covers western Arizona, southern California, and the peninsula. This includes the Havasupai, Walapai, Yavapai, Tonto Apache, Yuma-Apache, Apache-Yuma, Mohave, Maricopa, Yuma, Cahuilla, Serrano,[1] Luiseño, Diegueño, and the people throughout Baja California (or at least most of them[2]). Kroeber's map[3] showing the distribution of the practice in southern California includes Cupeño, Juaneño, Gabrielino, and Fernandeño, for whom I have no data. The Moapa and Shivwits Paiute on the margin of this area both cremate and bury. The Pima, who normally bury, cremate those killed on the warpath, and the Navaho sometimes burn the body with the lodge. The Zuñi now bury and have been doing so for some time, but Castañeda recorded that in 1540 they cremated.[4]

[1] Information from Doctor W. D. Strong.
[2] Curtis, II, 52, 72, 83, 92, 106, 114, 117; Bourke, (c), 501; Corbusier, 227, 337; James, (c), 148. Kroeber, (a), 281; Bourke, (a), 184; Allen, 615; Russell, (d), 202; Bartlett, II, 262; Cremony 103) states that the Maricopa bury; Trippel, 582; Hooper, 343; Davis, (c), 94, 99. Sparkman, 239; Kroeber (f), note 13; Baegert (387) gives burial for Baja California.
[3] Kroeber, (a), 295.
[4] Lowie, (i), 278; Russell, (d), 194; Curtis, II, 10, 110; Hrdlička, (e), 45. Cremony (102) gives cremation as the universal practice of the Pima; Lippa, 49; Stevenson, M. C., (b), 305; Winship, 518.

[Text continues on p. 295]

Children of Divorced Parents

586 A divorced mother usually desires to keep her children with her. The fact that they nearly always reside with the mother may result from a child's dependence upon a woman for food preparation, clothing care, and other services which a father may be unable and a stepmother unwilling to perform.

A divorced woman usually returns to the home of her parents until she remarries. If she is employed elsewhere, she nominally belongs to the household of her parents until she remarries. A man who marries a divorced woman with children usually accepts the economic responsibility of father-
[587] hood. Divorced mothers tend to remarry, while divorced fathers less frequently remarry. During the period when a divorced mother is unattached, and especially if she has no permanent residence, her children may divide their time between the homes of their paternal and maternal grandparents. Occasionally, each grandmother may take one or more of the children on a somewhat more permanent basis. It is said that a child may choose his residence if he has a preference.

586 Among the divorced women living in 1950, only one had failed to remarry.
593 At her divorce, her three sons were adult or nearly grown. All of them re-
[587] mained with their mother, making it economically unnecessary for her to find a husband. In the dispute which led to divorce, serious conflict developed between the father and one son who interfered when he thought his father was abusing his mother. The father was arrested and sent to prison for shooting at his son, and upon the father's return two years later, he lived
●[428] alone in another part of the village. While the father was alive, his former wife and his sons used most of his land, and upon his death they inherited all the land, one field going to his wife and the remainder being divided among the boys. The nature of this conflict and the father's term in prison probably served to establish residence of the sons with their mother. Moreover, pub-
[787] lic opinion supported this arrangement, for the father was given to various behaviors which made him most unpopular. (Interestingly, this man at one time reported seeing a spirit which counseled him to mend his ways)

586 In the 1950 population group, six other divorces had occurred among couples with children. Of these, only one father succeeded in keeping his children with him. He was an aggressive individual; said to be feared by his former wife. One cause leading to divorce was the father's opinion that his wife neglected their two daughters. The girls, who were very young at the time of the divorce, were cared for by their paternal grandmother until their father's remarriage. Because the paternal grandmother's hogan is located in the same camp area as that of her son and his family, she has actively participated in the rearing of the girls. Their stepmother, whose four babies all died in infancy, is said to have been a good mother to these girls. The younger, who may be somewhat below normal mentally, at 18 years of age went to live with her mother who has remarried and has a family of

families now and then share a meal, and since the female head of this extended family has become less active with age, she more frequently takes meals in one of the other households. 596 592 594

Another extended family has two patrilocal sons, but a third son, after a few weeks of patrilocal residence, changed to permanent matrilocal residence. His wife disliked living with his family, possibly, in part, because the camp group was already very large. A factor favoring the choice of matrilocal residence in this instance was the absence of a son in the wife's family. Also, in the patrilocal household, the married sons are dependents within the larger unit, whereas in the matrilocal household in this instance, the couple which changed from patrilocal residence occupies separate sleeping quarters and is more independent economically. 591 592

Among the patrilocal households including one son each, some form one household unit while others have individual houses and live separately.

Two households are matrilocal for obvious reasons. The son-in-law, in one instance, is a Walapai who is unwelcome on his own reservation but who gets along well with his wife's family and tribe. The other son-in-law, married to an only child, is himself an orphan, and his grandparents, with whom he formerly lived, have an overly crowded household.

Patrilineal inheritance tends to obscure a present trend away from patrilocal residence, the inheritance system drawing sons to their father's land when the parents are too old to work. In this circumstance, a married son farms and controls the family land. Nominally, he is living patrilocally, because his parents are considered the land owners until their death, but in reality, such a son returns from residence and employment elsewhere to care for his dependent parents and to protect his interest in the land which will constitute the major sum of his inheritance. 591 428

A trend over the last few years toward temporary or permanent residence outside Cataract Canyon for economic reasons has drained the reservation of many young men who otherwise would have inherited land or would have been residing patrilocally there.

Table 2 shows that family heads occupying land in Cataract Canyon include the older tribal members, while younger family heads have settled off the reservation. With only one exception, male family heads living on the reservation are over 50 years of age. Fifteen other married men, nominal residents of the reservation, are younger than 45. However, most, or perhaps all, of these 15 men seek periodic employment off the reservation. Among the male family heads residing off the reservation, only five are older than 55. The families living outside Cataract Canyon, of course, usually live in nuclear family units. The effects of acculturation and the importance of money in their economy make it very unlikely that more than [594]

591 a small percentage of those now living independently will ever return to the
428 reservation. The small acreage which each of them would inherit makes a mass return prohibitive, for they could not then live up to their present economic standard.

Divorce

586 Informants assert that in former times there were few divorces. Spier (1928, 224) reported that informants denied the practice, but he noted several examples of separations. Records of former generations collected at the present time show a number of divorces which may have been separations following trial marriages.

586b Formerly, divorce was proclaimed on a public occasion (such as at a
578 gambling session) when each party stated his or her side of the case. Al-
627 though this formality is now seldom carried out, an example was observed at the harvest celebration in 1951 when a shaman wished to divorce his Walapai wife after several years of marriage marked by other disputes and separations.

About noon when the group was assembling for dinner, the shaman stated his charges at some length, saying he wanted his wife to leave but that she refused. That night at the round dance, his wife made a brief statement that she did not wish to leave him but that he was making her do so. The following day she left Supai. (About a year later this couple was reunited, but eventually separated again.)

This was in no sense merely a public quarrel. Both husband and wife were present on both occasions but neither replied to the other, and all spectators kept their own counsel.

Adultery and Divorce

586 The reason for divorce in former times usually was adultery. It was
837 almost always the man who left his wife, either because she was the of-
684 fender, or because he preferred another woman. Usually a husband cut the hair of his adulterous wife two or three inches from her head, and beat her as well. Then he killed a horse belonging to his rival or beat the man up. One informant added, "If the other man didn't say anything back to the husband about the dead horse, then it could be forgotten, and sometime they could be friends again."

If a woman learned that her husband had been engaged in an affair with another woman, she would be angry and might leave. She would stay with her relatives or friends for awhile, then would return. Sometimes the relatives would force her to return although they knew her husband was at

422 by women in housekeeping, food gathering and so on.
562

In former times an individual's personal property, including clothing, tools, weapons, and other small articles, was burned at his death; today, [768] it is burned or interred with him. In aboriginal days a woman seldom owned anything that was not destroyed or discarded at her death. In primitive groups most personal property is useful only to members of the original owner's sex; among the Havasupai, therefore, women inherited nothing.

423 Land, trees, and horses were owned and inherited by men. Land was inherited by a man's sons and grandsons, or it reverted to males in his con-
●428 sanguine family, usually his brothers or nephews.

Tensions and Changes

578 Today, a certain amount of feminine resentment exists against male
562 priority in land inheritance. This resentment appears strongest among
428 women without brothers who saw land pass from their fathers to male rela-
177 tives such as cousins one or more degrees removed, and among widows who failed to inherit land from their husbands. Havasupai women observe that among their white neighbors women inherit and own property, including land, an example which encourages them in their desire for rights of ownership and inheritance equal with men. Since many of the younger women have achieved some measure of economic independence, it is unlikely that this experience will lead to their submissive acceptance of an increase in emphasis upon male precedence in ownership and inheritance rights.

428 In regard to aboriginal land ownership, Spier (1928, 231) wrote: "Title
562 to land is in the hands of the men, although because of its utilization, title might better be characterized as joint ownership by the family, the economic unit that works it. Women rarely have independent control of land; those who have are invariably widows without other means of support." He em-
[423] phasized, in his 1957 communication, that land is of no value to the Havasupai save as it is used. "There would have been no point for them owning land without putting it to use, at the moment or in the foreseeable future."

423 In the present population at least 10 women own one or more plots of
562 land. The number of feminine land owners is uncertain, because five of the women have sisters unmarried, living off the reservation, or living on the reservation but married to men who themselves own land. Under questioning, several of these women asserted that their land, or the use of it, would be redistributed, should the need arise, among their sisters under circumstances of marriage, change of residence, or widowhood. It appears that the present owners have the use of their lands, but that they hold such lands in trust for a group of related persons of which they are a part. The
[428] number of feminine land owners, therefore, is subject to change on the basis of heirship not yet settled.

Among the 10 feminine land owners, six women inherited land from their fathers while four inherited from their husbands. With one exception, in father-to-daughter inheritance, there were no sons; in the exception, the son himself inherited part of his father's land. The latter case is a good example of the role residence plays in land inheritance: Richard Siyuja died in 1946 leaving four adult children. His only son resides off the reservation, but several plots of land are considered his. Among the girls, only one seems permanently settled on the reservation, and the remainder of Richard's land is regarded as hers. However, she explained that if her sisters should move to Supai, she and her brother would give them some land or let them use it if they needed it. She made little or no distinction between ownership and use, apparently viewing it with small concern. She said her brother and all three sisters might farm their land together, dividing the harvest according to their individual needs. (This case lends support to Spier's emphasis upon land use as a factor in ownership.) 423 428 562

In only one of the six above cases was there a surviving brother of the deceased, and he has been a longtime resident on a neighboring reservation. However, there were other male relatives as closely related to the deceased as are some men who have inherited land. Also, three of the six women who inherited land are absentee land owners, two living, perhaps temporarily, at Grand Canyon and a third living permanently on another reservation.

Among the four widows who inherited from their husbands, three had dependent children while the fourth was childless. One widow with children remarried without losing her land, although her deceased husband had three surviving brothers. Some of her land has been divided among her sons as they have attained maturity, but she retains one plot for her own house and garden. The remaining three widows did not remarry. [587]

When the widow who remarried was again widowed after bearing a daughter by her second husband, she and her eldest stepdaughter bitterly contested ownership of three plots owned by the deceased. The tribal council decided in favor of the stepdaughter, reserving no land for two other stepdaughters or the widow's own daughter. The deciding factor here seems to have been need of the land.

Several of the women use all or part of their land themselves; others permit relatives to use it, sometimes on a share basis. A few plots of poor land remain unused. One of these women, in addition to her own land, farms a plot belonging to her absentee brother.

In another instance, a widow with dependent children inherited no land. Instead, it fell to her only adult son who now farms it. Expectation is that this son will divide the land with his brothers as they mature and need it. Because the son who inherited is unmarried and lives with his mother, she, in effect, has the use of the land in cooperation with her son for the suste-

423 nance of herself and her children.

428
562 A former land owner who died childless left her land, inherited from her husband, to her brother, who is now too feeble to work. The land has now descended to the use of her brother's son, although part of it is sometimes used by a man whose relationship to her, if any, is distant.

Three former residents of a small side canyon, a brother and sister and a man not closely related to them if at all, consider themselves joint owners of this small recess.

423 The attitude of women toward their general exclusion as inheritors of
428 land several times came to light during interviews. One woman, indicating
562 a piece of property where the house of her paternal crosscousin stands,
578 remarked, "That land is really mine. My father gave it to me when he died but--took it away from me." This woman's father also owned one of the newer houses which was not destroyed at his death, and which is now used by another of her male crosscousins.. This woman related that her father's house also belonged to her, but her cousin had taken possession of it. They quarreled when she asked for the house, and her cousin told her she could not have it unless she would saw it in two and take half. "But I didn't want that," she said. "We didn't speak for more than a year after that quarrel." She also claimed a horse which she did not receive, her male cousins inheriting all of her father's herd. Both the woman in question and her male cousins who took all of her father's property are aggressive individuals. The woman's husband is of mild temperament; had he been otherwise, settlement in this case might have been different.

In another instance, a widow who inherited land from her husband for the use of her minor children and herself, also claimed another plot that had belonged to him. However, the land was taken from her by the same man who claimed the house in the above case. This man was only remotely related to the deceased, if at all. The land was adjacent to, or near, his, and it appears that he was able to take possession mainly because there were no men in the widow's family who would take issue with him over it. The widow stated that the usurper slapped her and knocked her to the ground in a quarrel over it, but this has not been verified from other sources. (The widow in question has a marked tendency to fancy that others are persecuting her.)

[177] In summary, although land inheritance formerly was patrilineal, a small percentage of inheritors in recent years have been women, acquiring land either from consanguine or affinal relatives. Women seem increasingly interested in owning land in their own right, and several of them have acted aggressively to this end.

Ownership privileges of white women set an example which Havasupai women appear to envy. In addition, modifications in Havasûpai political and social structure with consequent economic adaptations point away from any increased emphasis upon patrilineal inheritance, and therefore, toward increased emphasis upon property ownership and land inheritance rights for women. 423 428 562 578 177

Arts and Crafts

Basket weaving is almost the sole outlet for creative artistic talent among the women. Interest in it has so fallen off that, in 1950, only half a dozen women were actively occupied in making baskets despite the fact that their supply never equals tourist demand. It was said that the work of a few other women who had tried basket weaving at one time or another was too inferior in quality for sale. Most of the older women are able to make twined baskets for their own use, but they seldom do. Apparently no one has twined a burden basket for some years, and only three examples of this type were observed about the village. The only other basket type seen in use was a broad, shallow tray convenient for winnowing seeds, parching corn, pinyon nuts, or seeds, and for drying peaches, figs, or other fruit. 285 463

Spier (1928, 126-7) identifies two coiled baskets, one a flattened globular form used for stone boiling and the other a tray used for winnowing or parching. An informant at the present time reports that a shallow bowl from which a family took its meals was also made by coiling. Presumably, all other basketry forms were produced by the twining technique. 285

Today the few utilitarian baskets woven are twined, while those made for sale to tourists are nearly all coiled.

Although women traditionally traded baskets to the Hopi, Navaho, and Paiute, demand lessened as metal containers became available. Basket weaving for home use declined, although the Havasupai continued to make certain types, including burden baskets and trays, which were not duplicated in metal form. [439] [177]

The advent of tourists to Grand Canyon National Park for a time stimulated interest in basket manufacture, but emphasis gradually changed from utility baskets in twined stitch to coiled ornamental basketry in a variety of new shapes and sizes. Coiling was the weave preferred by tourists.

Formerly, emphasis was upon utility rather than upon artistic effect or originality of decoration. Baskets were sturdy and durable. Weavers in general kept to basic styles, although the variety of shape in water bottles suggests some inventiveness beyond requirements of utility. Spier (1928, 124) reports four striking different shapes of water bottles, although three are variants of a single fundamental form.

175
648 boundary in 1882 the Government took no active interest in the Havasupai. In 1892 a government farmer was sent to instruct them in better methods of farming and the use of metal implements.

439 For many years the Havasupai have carried on an inter-tribal trade with the Navaho and Hopi, obtaining blankets, wool, and silver work in exchange for dressed skins, and agricultural products. The Hualapai on the west trade many of their raw deer hides to the Havasupai in exchange for the Navaho and Hopi goods in addition to fruit and vegetables.

ECONOMICS

262 The present Havasupai food supply is based principally on agricultural products and meat. Corn, beans, and squash are the staples, supplemented by onions, tomatoes, melons, and other garden vegetables. Beans are of two kinds, navy and pinto—the latter a red spotted bean. The fruit crops are peaches, nectarines, apricots, and figs.
[175] Peaches are said to have been introduced by John D. Lee, a Mormon,
[177] who lived as a fugitive among these people for several years following
233 1887. Meat in the early days was obtained by hunting, but today most of it is from their herds of range cattle.

592 The economic unit is the household, usually consisting of parents, children, and unattached close relatives. These small groups are closely bound into large ones by blood ties. This grouping is based on, or at least correlated, with the inheritance of land on the one hand
[328] and the temporary matrilocal residence on the other. Sometimes sev-
591 eral generations of these people live close together and work together, but each married couple and the progeny are regarded as a distinct
[591] unit. Some young couples build a home soon after they marry, but it is customary for them to live with the wife's parents until they have a home of their own.

428 Property descends through the male line. If a man dies his effects do not descend to his wife but to his sons. The sons may hold land or stock undivided for years until they have families of their own whose diverse interests make division necessary. The widow and unmarried daughters do share in the use of the land; but they cannot
[763] lay claim to it, since the widow's relatives and the daughter's children never inherit it from them. If a widow hastily re-marries, her "use" interest is lost, reverting to the other heirs. Should there be no direct heirs, the property goes to the dead man's brothers or their male descendants.

423 When not living out of the canyon in the winter, the Indians live in a section of the canyon not much more than a mile in length. Ownership of the arable land is communal. Every family has a piece of land, which is recognized as belonging to it by the rest of the tribe. By established custom the land is inherited and may be sold to a fellow tribesman. One peculiar condition that caused some trouble in the past was the ownership by one Havasupai of fruit trees growing on the lands in possession of another, brought about, it was reported, by certain complications in inheritance.

422 A short distance above Supai village Walapai Canyon branches off to the west. In the upper end is grazed a herd of individually owned cattle. The men visit the herd occasionally to bring in a beef to the
[422 settlement. The meat of the animal is sold or traded and is eaten in
251] a day or two, there being no means of keeping meat other than as jerky.

Horses and cattle are owned and herded by the men alone. The men are also the owners of the house and land on which it stands. Property, such as a man's tools, buckskins, weapons, saddle, and perhaps a charm and a mask; a woman's field tools, baskets, cooking uten-

8:Service E-5 (1946) 1947
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

Several changes have occurred since Spier's visits. The Indians no longer spend the fall and winter months of each year on the Plateau gathering wild foods and hunting. Males are more prominent nowadays as workers of agricultural land, possibly because this is the chief source of food, whereas in earlier times male hunting and female gathering were important supplementary food-getting activities, especially during the season of Plateau residence. White influence, too, is undoubtedly effective in promoting male predominance. Correlated with the above changes, the custom of temporary matrilocal postmarital residence is disappearing.

Out of 57 intra-village marriages in the past 30 years, 38 were clearly patrilocal, 16 intermediate, and 3 permanently matrilocal. The patrilocal couples all work on the husband's family's land, or have already inherited a share of it. All of the 16 "intermediate" couples live where they do because of various exigencies involving the inheritance of the land they work and/or the acquisition of one of the few permanent type houses. Of the three cases of matrilocality, two occurred because the male's father's household had died out. The other case is that of Spoonhead, who inherited no land from his own family. The reason for this will be mentioned later.

It therefore appears that the second of Spier's conditions has taken place to some extent, namely, an increase in male prominence with more regularity in patrilocal residence. Furthermore, this seems correlated with patrilineal inheritance of land. Apparently this inheritance, however, has not been of the sort that has furthered the patrilineal tracing of kindred. Disposal of land has often been attended by acrimonious disputes, so that one is probably justified in judging that perhaps neither individual ownership nor simple patrilineal succession are necessarily the only rules by which land is allocated. With this in mind I shall attempt to describe land rights by summing up data which involved circumstantial cases of inheritance, transactions, wills, and other overt manifestations.

Items of personal use other than land are clearly owned by the individual, and objects which are *on* the land—houses, crops, horses, and the few cattle—are also individually owned, for there is abundant evidence that a person can dispose of these items largely as he wishes. When he dies, much of his personal property is buried with him, his house is burned or abandoned,[4] and the crops he

4 About half of the houses are now of a permanent type and are not burned at the occupant's death, but are temporarily abandoned, to be occupied later when needed. There is no particular rule of inheritance with respect to the permanent houses, so they can be considered negligible as a factor in this discussion of inheritance. In another type of community, house ownership could, of course, be very important. See Elsie Clews Parsons, *The House-Clan*

8:Service E-5 (1946) 1947
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

planted stand in the fields and rot or are destroyed. These things are so clearly his that it seems disgraceful that anyone else should consider using them after he is dead. The land, however, is not so closely associated with the man who uses it. He can plant on it whatever he chooses, but has no right to dispose of it as he sees fit without consulting his relatives, and additionally, the opinion of the whole closely integrated community is an important factor influencing any decision he may wish to make.

Tribal government is vested in the three native chiefs who are now permanent members of the council created by the Indian Office, but the chiefs and the council exercise little authority, although they are encouraged to do so. Problems of inheritance and land rights, if not solved by the family, are usually argued out and settled by general public opinion, or in extreme cases of non-agreement are carried to the Government Agent as a last resort. For several years the Indian Office has encouraged the Havasupai to make legal statements and wills which would settle the disputes so often attending redistribution of land after a death. These attempts were, of course, based on the assumption that the Havasupai men owned their land as we own ours. That this assumption was not accurate,[5] however, is attested by the fact that in most of the few cases on record, the wills were disputed, and the land was finally redistributed according to the usual complex pattern which pays little or no attention to any perverse notions of the previous occupant.

When Prince Wodo was a feeble old man, he wanted to turn his land over to Lemuel Paya and Henry Hanna, who had been caring for him. Henry was a cousin, and Lemuel was a more distant relative by marriage. Wodo's daughter Lily, and his niece Katie, who had not taken any responsibility for his care, were left out. They started a fuss which became quite bitter. It is said that the old man was so upset that he locked himself in his house, set fire to it, and burned to death. Katie and Lily divided the land. The inheritance pattern which justified this will be discussed below; suffice it at present to note that even in this dramatic situation, Prince Wodo had no voice in the disposition of the land which he had worked all his life.

It should be apparent from the above discussion that familial rights outrank individual rights. As mentioned before, however, the fact of disputes and

Complex of the Pueblos (in *Essays in Anthropology Presented to A. L. Kroeber*, pp. 229-232, Berkeley, 1936).

5 This is not said as stricture, and furthermore it does not apply to Mr Noble O. Guthrie, the present sub-agent in charge at Supai. He has made a sincere effort to understand the ways of the Indians, and has achieved considerable success. I am extremely indebted to him for his interest and coöperation.

8:Service E-5 (1946) 1947
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

complexities indicates that factors other than simple familial inheritance rules must also be operative. In order to extract some sense from the obvious intricacies of inheritance, it was necessary to prepare a community genealogy, and to draft a detailed map showing the location and the proprietorship of each little plot of land; then the history of each of these individual pieces of land was detailed back as far as it was practical. From a study of the mass of this sort of data, it is possible to isolate three main considerations which tend to govern the familial and community decisions in land reallocation.

First, and most obvious, is closeness of relationship. It must be noted in this regard that "closeness" is perhaps better understood here to involve personal closeness and propinquity rather than actual blood relationship, though the two usually tend to be coincident. Thus a relative who lives and works in close harmony with his other relatives is considered nearer than one who lives away.[6] A second factor involves the personal qualities of the heirs, for a high premium is placed on industry and coöperation. A third factor, and an important one, is the relative needs of the persons being considered. Either or both of the second and third considerations often outweigh closeness of relationship.

I shall illustrate these three points with examples and supplementary discussion. When Gattagama died, Crook, his only heir, received all the land. This is a simple case of patrilineal inheritance, father to son. This is the only example of such simple inheritance, however, for this father and only son relationship is unusual.

The second factor, that allocation of land depends to some extent on the personal qualifications of the individual, is often very important. The three men who are poorest in land holdings, Joe Jones, Pete Mulgullo, and Spoonhead, can be cited to illustrate this point. Joe Jones is one of three brothers, but he inherited very little compared to the other two, because it is said, "He was lazy and wouldn't work." Pete Mulgullo never was interested in farming and, when he was younger, preferred to leave the canyon periodically to work for white men instead of helping care for the familial lands. Spoonhead is lazy and also has been regarded as not quite right in the head.

The third factor, need, is frequently decisive in determining which of several claimants to a plot of land will get it, or if several plots are involved, who will get the most. This concern over need operates at all times and it is not unusual that for this reason alone a distant relative of a dead man might get more land

6 See Mischa Titiev, *The Influence of Common Residence on the Unilateral Classification of Kindred* (American Anthropologist, vol. 45, pp. 511-530, 1943).

8:Service E-5 (1946) 1947
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

than a closer one. It is explicitly felt and avowed that no man should be without enough land for himself and his family, and it is this feeling which tends to keep land holdings more equalized than they would be otherwise. It is quite possible that in this factor public opinion, with a conception of community rights in land, intrudes itself most clearly and overrides the idea of familial rights.

All this is not to say that the land is at any given time always equally divided among families in accordance with the enumerated principles. For example, there is at the present time a widespread dissatisfaction with the amount of land controlled by the Sinyella family. This is because, of the once numerous family, only two brothers remain in the canyon, and they are both unable to work. Consequently they have considerably more land than they can use. This excess land lies idle because several younger members of the Sinyella family are now living outside the canyon. It is difficult to foretell exactly how the community will resolve this situation, but I should guess that if the younger Sinyellas do not return soon, someone else, probably newlyweds, will get permission to use some of the land. After a period of occupation, this land will be thought of as theirs. This is the way such conditions have often worked out previously. Spier has stated that proprietary rights in land depended most emphatically on use,[7] and this feeling seems to be strong today. It is difficult to lend a piece of land for a while, for after the new incumbent has used it for more than a couple of years, he has a pretty valid claim on it and is difficult to dislodge.

In some cases widows hold some of their husband's land, but it is usually, perhaps always, because of the magnanimity of their dead husband's relatives. As soon as a widow remarries, the land reverts to the original family.[8] In general, land tends to stay in the consanguineal family. Rarely, a daughter as well as a son may share in the family land, especially if she marries a man who has little or no land of his own. The Havasupai *say* that newlyweds should be given land by whichever family can best afford it, or preferably by both. If they are not given land outright, as is sometimes the case, they should help work the land and share in the produce of whichever family can best accommodate them. Detailed inheritance histories show that actually the husband's family tends to assume this burden more often than the girl's, but it is not a clear cut rule. As already suggested, it is this condition which seems to determine the present day post-marital residence. There is no marriage rule, beyond a feeling that close

7 *Havasupai Ethnography*, p. 231.

8 See Ruth Benedict, *Marital Property Rights in Bilateral Society* (American Anthropologist, vol. 38, pp. 368-373, 1936).

595 ried, the women being monopolized, with or without their will, by the wealthier and more influential men of the tribe. The male population is in excess [162] of the female; hence it sometimes happens that Hua-la-pai squaws are mar- [582] ried; and in one instance a Moqui woman, a probable outcast from her own nation, was observed by us.

The children do not seem to have reg- 423 ular property, as with the Pueblos, un- 428 til after puberty, although, on the death 858 of the father, his portable property is 171 inherited by the son, for sacrifice at the rites to be described further on.

The head chieftaincy is hereditary. 622 In the absence of a son, the chief's neph- 643 ew on the father's side is, I believe, chosen as successor. All of the subchiefs are named by the head chief, on account of personal preference, wealth, or influence. There seems to be no dis- 554 tinct order of warriors; when a scalp is 565 taken, it is brought to the village, and a dance, celebrating the death of the [727] enemy, is given in honor of the victor, and the body is then cremated; no record or mark of dress being preserved to represent the rank or prowess of the warrior. In case of hostility, obligations to war are simply coextensive with the adult population. There is, however, a certain importance attached to one of the warriors, who is supposed to have in his keeping a medicine of war, and who, by virtue of his valor and possession, is [624] a sort of war chief, although the civil and martial affairs of the nation are more closely allied than is the case with most Indian tribes.

Nor is the ecclesiastical much distin- 643 guished from the civil, with them; for 793 the head chief combines with his political office the caciqueship, or that which in Zuñi is distinctively religious, being termed Kia-kwe-mo-so-ne, or "Mastership of the House," — a kind of high-priesthood. He not only presides at the more important councils, makes treaties with other tribes, etc., directs

/101 cont./
622 and fair-minded; he ruled his people with unquestioned firmness, yet with fairness.

428 611 551 [614] [171] Children belong to and inherit property through the father. No trace of a clan system has been found, even in the naming of children, the means by which totemic names are perpetuated among the Yuman tribes of the Colorado river. In these tribes all the female descendants in the male line bear the gentile name, if such it may be called, but the Havasupai name their girls from some incident in their lives or from individual peculiarity, as, for instance, Tasáwiché, "Sunlight through the Leaves," Matékaliwa, "Flapping Ears," and Chékúchéku, "Dancing between Two Men." In so small a tribe a complete
582 [182] [614] clan organization, even if such existed, could hardly be perpetuated, since marriages between blood relations, though comparatively remote, are inevitable, and in the case of the Havasupai they are so common that no one can fathom the intricacies of his various relationships to other members of the
584 tribe. Marriage is by consent of the girl's parents and is without
585 ceremony. Polygamy being common, property is held in
595 severalty by man and wife, and in case of separation each takes
421 his own.

764 [177] Until very recently the dead, as in all Yuman tribes were cremated; the present form of burial is in shallow graves in the rocks at the foot of the cliff. After death the family and friends assemble to mourn and tell the departed one that they are troubled, for they do not know where he has gone. Formerly
768 horses were killed at the grave, and all earthly possessions of the deceased, even /102/ his peach trees, were burned. Food was burned with the body, and the dwelling was razed and taken away to be rebuilt.

755 The medicine-men in their practices use no herbs, but
756 resort wholly to incantation, believing that power to heal comes to them in childhood through dream-songs. Besides singing, the medicine-man sucks the seat of pain and pretends to extract therefrom either evil blood or foreign objects that cause the ill-
756 ness. In case of successful treatment the medicine-man is remunerated. He must keep the average of failures at a minimum,